

sufficient in my opinion, and the strict application of the Code is the best solution of the case. In fact *Elampus* must supersede *Notozus* Förster under the Law of Priority (if the type-species of the latter is designated accordingly). This synonymy implies other (mainly restored) combinations of names for the species now placed in *Notozus*; it does not lead to any confusion between species.

Rejecting *Elampus*, on the other hand, would increase the number of exceptions to the Code. Such exceptions are very undesirable in my opinion, and their number should be kept as low as possible. I feel strongly that nomenclatural problems should be resolved by automatic rules. Otherwise we should have a set of individual cases, and the Code would lose most of its value.

(2) By R.M. Bohart (*University of California, Davis, California 95616 U.S.A.*)

I object to the replacement of *Elampus* Spinola, 1806 with *Notozus*, 1853, and on the whole it appears that Mr Huber's arguments are weak. He suggests that the status of the name *Elampus* is vague since the originally included species were not all congeneric in modern terms. Since this circumstance was common in the nineteenth century, it carries little weight. The fact is that Latreille's 1810 designation of *Chrysis panzeri* Fabricius 1804 as the type-species of *Elampus* adequately defined the genus in the sense it has been used consistently in North America since 1939. There is no basis for Huber's claim that "*Elampus* is essentially an unused or misused name"

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *HALECIUM* OKEN, 1815. Z.N.(S.)2116
(see vol. 32: 252-254)

By H. Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Universitetsparken 15, Copenhagen, Denmark*)

The purpose of this application can be met simply by first validating (under the plenary powers) the generic name *Halecium* as from Oken, 1815, and by then designating *Sertularia halecina* as type of *Thoa* - which would then become a junior objective synonym of *Halecium* and need no further treatment. If that course were adopted, then the applicant's proposal (1) (b) could be deleted.

Reply by Dr Cornelius

It seems that Dr Lemche's ingenious formula is perfectly adequate. I therefore designate *Sertularia halecina* Linnaeus, 1758 (: 809) as type-species of *Thoa* Lamouroux, 1816 (: 210), but stipulate that this designation shall be consequent upon the Commission's accepting my proposal that *Halecium* be made available. The withdrawal of my original proposals for the suppression of *Thoa* is also consequent upon that action.

Incidentally, Dr Lemche's proposal also removes any possible threat by *Thoa* to *Eudendrium* Ehrenberg, 1834. Therefore my proposals (3), to place that name on the Official List, and (4) (b), to place *ramosa*, *Tubularia*, Linnaeus, 1758, on the Official List can also be withdrawn, together with proposal (5) (b), to place EUDENDRIIDAE on the Official List. My application is thus limited to the validation of *Halecium* under the plenary powers, with the consequences that flow directly from that concerning the specific name of the type-species and the family name.